DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 703 FL 022 548

AUTHOR	Phillipson, Robert, Ed.; Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Ed.
TITLE	Papers from the Round Table on Language Policy in Europe, April 22, 1994. ROLIG-papir 52.
INSTITUTION	Roskilde Univ. Center (Denmark).
REPORT NO	ISSN-0106-0821
PUB DATE	Aug 94
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, Roskilde University Center, P.O. Box 260, DK-4000, Roskilde, Denmark (free).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	English; Foreign Countries; French; German; *Government Role; *International Cooperation; International Relations; Language Attitudes; Language Maintenance; *Language Planning; Language Usage; *Multilingualism; *Public Policy; Second Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Africa; *Europe

ABSTRACT

This collection of seven papers addresses language policy in Europe, focusing on the role of national and supranational language policy on European integration. The papers include: (1) "Language Policy for the 21st Century: Lessons from History" (Gyorgy Szepe); (2) "Lessons for Eastern Europe from Language Policy in Africa" (Josef Schmied); (3) "The Spread of Dominant Languages (English, French, and German) in Multilingual Europe" (Robert Phillipson); (4) "Dominant 'International Languages' in Europe" (Claude Truchot); (5) "Language Policy in the Baltic States" (Mart Rannut); (6) "Educational Challenges in Multilingual Central Europe" (Zsofia Radnai); and (7) "Educational Challenges in Multilingual Western Europe" (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas). Two appendixes contain the program for the EUROLING Round Table, questions related to European language policy, and an extract from the EUROLING project description on project goals. (Contains 52 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 376 703

ROLIG papir

Robert Phillipson
and
Tove Skutnabb-
Kangas, eds.

Papers from the
Round Table on
Language Policy
in Europe,
April 22, 1994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hartmut Haberland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

52 | 94

Roskilde UniversitetsCenter
Lingvistgruppen

FL 022548

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISSN 0106-0821

ROLIG-papir 52
Roskilde Universitetscenter
Lingvistgruppen

Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds.

Papers from the Round Table on Language Policy in Europe, April 22, 1994

ROLIG-papir is a series of working papers written by members of ROLIG, the linguistic circle of Roskilde University Center, and others. Readers are invited to comment on or criticize the papers. For ordering information, see the back of this page.

Roskilde Universitetscenter
August 1994

ROLIG papers are distributed free of charge to any private person or institution on our mailing list. Write to: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, Roskilde University Center, P.O.Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: tarzan@jane.ruc.dk
FAX: (+45) 46 75 44 10
In the USA, most ROLIG-papers are available on microfiche/paper from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, c/o CAL, 1118 22nd Stret, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20067

ROLIG-papirerne bliver sendt gratis til alle der står i vores adressekartotek.
ROLIGs adresse er: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, RUC, Postbox 260, 4000 Roskilde
elektronisk post: tarzan@jane.ruc.dk
FAX: 46 75 44 10

LANGUAGE POLICY IN EUROPE

Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.)

LIST OF CONTENTS

Robert Phillipson and **Tove Skutnabb-Kangas** 2
Introduction

György Szépe, Janos Pannonius University, Pécs, Hungary 4
Language policy for the 21st century - lessons from history

Josef Schmied, Universities of Bayreuth and Chemnitz-Zwickau, Germany 11
Lessons for Eastern Europe from language policy in Africa

Robert Phillipson, Roskilde University, Denmark 18
The spread of dominant languages (English, French and German) in multilingual Europe

Claude Truchot, Université de Franche-Comté (Besançon), France 23
The spread of dominant languages (English, French and German) in multilingual Europe

Mart Rannut, Director-General, Estonian Language Board 25
Language policy in the Baltic states

Zsófia Radnai, Janos Pannonius University, Pécs, Hungary 27
Educational challenges in multilingual Central Europe

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde University, Denmark 30
Educational challenges in multilingual Western Europe

Consolidated bibliography 38

Appendix 1 Programme of the Round Table and questions for advance reflection 42

Appendix 2 Extract from EUROLING project description on project goals 45

INTRODUCTION

Robert Phillipson and **Tove Skutnabb-Kangas**

"The greatest danger to the Danish language is the Danes", concludes a recent study of Danish attitudes to their language (1). Language policy rouses emotions and is a significant dimension of personal, social, professional and political life. One of the hopes of the EUROLING project is to contribute to the analysis of language policy in Denmark, policy on the "national" language, "foreign" languages and minority languages, and to approach these matters scientifically. The project is concerned with how language policy is evolving in all parts of Europe - where much is taking place at the national, regional and supra-national levels - and to identify what the dangers, delights and challenges are, as well as relevant theoretical approaches and international experience.

This volume contains the papers delivered at the first public activity of the EUROLING project, a Round Table held at the University of Roskilde on 22 April 1994 (see Appendix 1 for the programme and the list of questions that participants were invited to think over in advance). Contributors came from Estonia, France, Germany and Hungary, and remained in Denmark for a couple of days planning future research collaboration on language policy.

The event was funded by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, as part of its grant to Robert Phillipson for the EUROLING project, and by the network on foreign language pedagogy, which brings together many Danish higher education institutions. We are grateful to them for their support.

Language policy is a central dimension in the European "integration" project. Decisions on choice of language(s) in education systems and in business, the media, administrative and political life have major implications for the type of Europe that is taking shape. As the ethno-nationalist revival of recent years has demonstrated, language is a key element in the legitimacy and stability of states internally as well as a key link externally. All the more reason that language policy should be seriously studied, rather than being left to chance, external or "free market" pressures, and the in-built resistance to change of the education system. Appendix 2 is part of the initial research planning for the EUROLING project, and Claude Truchot's contribution to this publication lists several domains and relevant variables in such research, many of which have been explored in his published work.

As the papers here reveal, much is being done in Europe, North America, and Australia in this field. The education systems of many countries aim at multilingual or bilingual learning, or are considering a move in this direction. Language policy is the topic of several recent publications (2), and research collaboration is being put on a surer footing, as one dimension of increased "internationalisation". In addition to the EUROLING project itself, several of the scholars attached to it are associated with an attempt to link scholarship in European Union countries with Mediterranean scholars, with EU funding (the MEDCAMP scheme), in the area of language policy (coordinator Professor Bernard Spolsky, of Bar-Ilan University, Israel).

The papers contained in this volume are presented in the form that they were delivered in Roskilde, and no attempt has been made to deprive them of the flavour of the original delivery. There is further coverage of language policy in Estonia in Mart Rannut's paper on this topic in **Linguistic Human Rights: overcoming linguistic discrimination**, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson (in collaboration with Mart Rannut), published by Mouton de Gruyter, in the Contributions to the Sociology of Language series, in August 1994. There is also coverage of more educational issues in the article by Mart and Ülle Rannut in **Multilingualism for all**, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, an anthology which considers how schooling leading to high levels of multingualism can best be organized.

Notes:

1. "Danskerne er så forvænte med at have deres eget sprog, at de ikke drømmer om, at det kunne være anderledes. Derfor er de ikke rigtig blevet klar over, hvor vigtigt det er for dem, og derfor fordamper meget af den energi, der kunne investeres i en mere overordnet sprogrøgt, i nidkær omsorg for de mindre spørgsmål.
   Ved udgangen af dette årtusinde har det danske sprog ca. 1000 år bag sig som selvstændigt sprog. Hvis det også skal have 1000 år foran sig, må sprogdebat og sprogstyring ind i nye rammer. Den største fare for det danske sprog er danskerne."
   (Jørgen Lund, "Danskerne og deres sprog 1945-1990. Kritik og tolerance", i **Dansk Identitetshistorie 4, Danmark og Europa 1940-1990**, red. Ole Feldbæk, 1992, Reitzel, 421-540).

2. A starting point would be Baldauf & Luke (eds.) 1990; Labrie 1993; Lambert (ed.) 1994; Sajavaara et al. (eds.) 1993; Truchot (ed.) 1994 and the thematic number **English only? in Europe/in Europa/en Europe, Sociolinguistica** 9, The International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics, 1994. See also the references in Szepe's paper.

LANGUAGE POLICY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY - LESSONS FROM HISTORY*

György Szépe

1. THREE ANTECEDENTS

1.1. The UNESCO meeting of Beijing

As early as February 1988, Unesco began to elaborate its own language policy in the sense of looking ahead towards the 21st century. After a small meeting of general-staff character a questionnaire was issued by AILA and other contributions were gathered. On November 27 - December 2, 1989 in Beijing, Unesco organized its "International Symposium and Round Table [on] Qualities Required of Education Today to Meet Foreseeable Demands in the Twenty-First Century". Since it happened that I was the only person present involved in languages (representing FIPLV), I had to draft the Chapter on "Languages and Language Teaching" (enclosed under **Appendix # 1**).

1.2. The contribution of AILA

AILA has published the results of its questionnaire project (in a paper "Language Teaching in the Perspective of the Predictable Requirements of the Twenty-first Century" written by John L.M. Trim) and some other future oriented papers in a small volume in 1992: **Language Teaching in the Twenty-first Century. Problems and Prospects** (ed. by Johan F. Matter) = volume 9 of **AILA Review**, 68 pp.

1.3. The contribution of FIPLV

FIPLV gradually developed its interest in language policy, which was partially due to the fact that its XVIth World Congress was held in Australia, one of the rare countries having an explicit language policy.

FIPLV also took part in preparing "Proposed Articles for A Universal Charter of Basic Human Language Rights" (enclosed under **Appendix # 2**).

Its major contribution, however, was a collective report for Unesco which was published in English and French. The English version is titled **Language policies for the world of the twenty-first century.** Report for Unesco. FIPLV: Paris, 1993 [August]. 50 pp. It is written by Edward Batley (UK), Michel Candelier (F), Gisela Hermann-Brennecke (D), and György Szépe (H). The small volume contains eight chapters: Introduction (pp. 1-4); Language learning and ethnic understanding (pp. 5-9); Mother tongues and the official languages of State (pp. 10-19); Foreign languages education (pp. 20-36); Languages and the New Technology (pp. 37-39); 6th Chapter: Human language rights (pp.40-44); Recommendations (pp. 45-49); Priority research

subjects (p. 50). The authors have tried to integrate several important facets of language policy (keeping in mind that FIPLV is mostly interested in the teaching of foreign languages). Some issues appeared first in a document coming from foreign language teaching circles, e.g. mother tongue education, bilingual education, language rights, immersion, language needs of refugees etc.

2. SOME FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES CONCERNING LANGUAGE POLICY

2.1. The meaning of 'language policy'

In English it is possible to distinguish between 'language policy' and 'language politics'. The first (language policy) is close to the discipline of language planning; it implies long range provisions on language. The second (language politics) is usually related to political power. The two aspects, however, are not always easy to separate.

I consider language policy not as an end to itself, rather as a means for something extralinguistic: enhancing the benefit of people. In many cases 'language' is one of the demographical parameters (as for gender, race, religion, ethnic membership) which may serve purposes of either discrimination or development. In other cases 'language' is a symbol of identification for a group of people, and therefore it has a particular relevance in many respects.

The social framework of language policy is usually determined by the State (but there are other frameworks, as well).

Language policy as a discipline - which is **ipso facto** international - has the task of integrating all kinds of experiences of the heterogeneous practice.

By integration we mean formulating some kind of theory, which will - in its turn - be a part of a "theory of human beings in society". Language policy will thus be closely bound to the field of human rights.

Language policy as a discipline ranges into the normative disciplines insofar that it is cultivated in order to establish international norms of conduct for States and other agencies.

2.2. Lessons from history: the solving of current conflicts and the planning of avoidance of possible conflicts

This is an important facet in the above sense, but I have to skip it for the sake of lack of time.

2.3. The structure of the 21st century: what kind of future(s)?

There are very important external categories for any kind of human activity in the future; e.g. survival of humankind, peace, the avoidance of destruction of society and nature. These are the global issues. (May I mention here that we are now living in the framework of something like a Pax Americana (shared with other super or great powers such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Russia and China) which has a

considerable impact on the planning of foreign language acquisition either directly or indirectly (mediated by economy and culture).

Language policy is also connected to global issues not only through the overall relevance of language, but also through education - where language is a major instrument - and through literacy (illiteracy can be viewed as a major plague).

2.4. Foreseeable general trends: integration, competition & conflicts, and survival; development, stagnation, recession

Integration in this context means political & geographical integration, primarily the making of European Union. If we forget about rhetorics of the procedure of integrating then it becomes clear that it is not only an action **for** European States (mainly of those which are already in the club), but also an action **against** the USA, Japan, Russia and others. Therefore, we can only partially build a language policy upon the ideology of a united Europe. The first division of languages in this European framework is English **vs.** the rest; the second cut is major languages (English, French and German) **vs.** the languages of the Union; at the third level there are three dichotomies: State languages of the Union **vs.** minority languages of the Union; national minority languages in a State vs. (recently) immigrated minority languages in the State, and (State) languages of the Union **vs.** any other language. (It is not necessary to go on.)

This scheme contains diverse relations from the "war of languages" through the competition of language until the co-existence of languages which boils down to transform bilingualism & multi-culturalism into the cornerstones of a regional language policy.

One has to take into consideration the Darwinian effects the free market exerts on the "ecosystem" of languages, and at the same time one needs to view these languages as a part of the cultural heritage of humankind. The former one makes the great greater and the small smaller, while the latter one calls for an equal recognition of values among language communities.

Much more attention is paid in language policy to development than to stagnation and recession. Stagnation of the developed leaves countries in a high status, while stagnation of the "undeveloped" perpetuates their low status (which is simply: poverty and deprivation).

Recession as a term is seldom used in language policy texts. Language policy is probably concerned with assuring mother tongue use & education (including literacy education) as fundamental language rights even in the circumstances of recession.

2.5. The methods of prediction: extrapolation, development planning, equilibrium planning

Planning can be implemented in the context of the previous strategic parameters. One can plan development or the maintenance of status quo, but usually there is no planning of decline (though sometimes it can be foreseen). Prevention of unwanted future, i.e. the protection of the "underdogs" is a legitimate task of language policy.

(Here we have to remember that the human rights of individuals or small groups of people have to be respected in any circumstances even if empires collapse and civil

wars are around. Language is second to saving life in extraordinary times, but before many, many other factors.)

2.6. The context of language policy planning: political history, world market mechanism, educational policy, international cultural policy, communication and mobility; philosophy of human dignity and human rights

This is a rather mixed group of options & variants; not even an exhaustive catalogue exists. It would be early to endeavor a strict system or rules. Some samples will be mentioned for the sake of illustration rather than for analysis.

Political history (as if it were the most researched branch of historical disciplines) generally furnishes precedents which can be "extrapolated" (projected rather) for the future. But with the change historical experience accumulates, new arguments are shaped, therefore each instance has to be appreciated/anticipated on its own value.

World market mechanism can be predicted, of course, without any regard to language; this mechanism, however, can be viewed to function as a classical cybernetical closed system (with feedback). Equilibrium seems to be indispensable for it; and language can be a major component of equilibria.

Market planning on a smaller scale (e.g. state or region) is somehow connected with granting/or not granting freedom for the mobility of wares, peoples, ideas, and let us add: languages. This is very much connected in our times to communication.

Educational policy usually functions in the service of development. Educational policy may well overlap extensively with language policy, for instance when the overall planning of foreign language teaching is a major dimension of an educational system. For the planning of a language policy, qualitative data on language knowledge are also necessary.

Cultural policy is also a possible framework for some aspects of planning language policy in spite of the deplorable fact that cultural policy is seldom planned at all. Cultural policy can be sensitive to values that language knowledge and use - if transformed into values - can become part of.

2.7. The possible strategies of planning language policy

The zero option is not to do anything: "laissez faire, laisser passer, le monde va de lui-même". Yes, but this will go to the detriment of the dominated.

The maximal option is to regulate as many aspects of life as possible, because this would fasten & straighten progress. This option implies, however, a brain trust which knows things better than people do. We have experienced the results of such a voluntarist overplanning.

There is a wide range of real options between the two above-mentioned extremities. I would not venture enumerating all of them. Here I am offering a very simple option. Let the world go and we should participate in it; but let us also watch it. A two level monitoring system should be established, somehow connected with the monitoring of peace, security and human rights. (The first level should be nationwide, the second international.) And if needed let us take actions of second rhythm. Let us

react on the basis of human dignity and human rights.

3. INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION

This is not a lecture which would tolerate a sophisticated conclusion: my symbolic conclusion is made of three sentences.

The first is the Voltairean advice: "Il faut cultiver notre jardin" (i.e. we have to cultivate our garden).

Next comes a remark: the whole world is gradually becoming an interconnected system of gardens, and this garden is multilingual.

Some people have the responsibility to draw the attention on matters of the soil of this garden, some other have to watch the air, yet others have to monitor the waters; some will certainly have to take care of plants and animals, while we have to be alert to the changes in people: the talking animals.

And it would be nice to establish the discipline...

* This is the summary of a paper which was presented. The underlined subtitles are items of the handout.- G. S.

Appendix # 1

Languages and language teaching
(Subchapter 1, within the chapter "Communication" of the report "Learning to care: education for the twenty-first century", in: *International Symposium and Round Table [on] Qualities Required of Education Today to Meet Foreseeable Demands in the Twenty-First Century*. Unesco: Beijing, [November 27 - December 2] 1989).

A policy for the teaching of languages is needed both to enable people with different mother tongues within a country to communicate and participate in that society and to provide for foreign language teaching to be a high priority in the progressively interconnected world of the twenty-first century. A case for a world language was considered at the symposium, and it was recognized that, with mass communications now operating on a global scale, there is a real possibility of the English language becoming progressively dominant. However, the importance of preserving the rich cultural heritages embodied in the world's variety of language was recognized as being essential.

In considering language education of the twenty-first century the following points were made:

(a) Mother tongue, or the language of home should be used in the beginning years of schooling where possible. Reading and writing skills in the mother tongue can later be built on in the context of lifelong education. However, countries will need to decide their own language policies in conformity with their national objectives.

(b) Foreign languages in schools will require greater attention.This can be provided by teaching entire school subjects in the foreign language and by developing bilingual or total immersion schools. Teachers also need to be knowledgeable about different cultures and cultural implications in addition to language itself.

(c) There may need to be different foreign language programs for groups with different needs e.g. foreign language suitable for skilled workers in a mobile workforce or for academics in specific disciplines.

(d) Systems should be considered in which language minorities can profit educationally from knowing another language rather than being penalized as at present tend to happen within centralized educational systems.

(e) The variety of languages taught at schools may need to increase with for example the inclusion of major oriental languages to enhance intercontinental communication.

(f) Exchanges of both pupils and teachers between countries could greatly benefit foreign language programs.

(g) Artificial languages including computer programming need to be considered within a language policy.

Appendix # 2

FIPLV Proposed Articles for
A Universal Charter of Basic Human Language Rights*

1. Every person has the right to acquire his or her mother tongue.
2. Every person has the right to acquire the official language or languages of the country in which he or she receives his or her education.
3. Every person has the right to special assistance in order to overcome illiteracy or other forms of language handicap.
4. Every person has the right to learn any one or more languages.
5. Every person has the right of access to any language.
6. Every person has the right to freedom of expression in any language.
7. Every person has the right to identify with any language and to have the choice respected.
8. Every person has the right to be taught the language with which he or she and his or her family most readily identify.
9. Every person has the right to be taught the official language or languages of the country of which he or she is a permanent resident.
10. Every person has the right to be taught at least one additional language so as to extend his or her social, cultural, educational and intellectual horizons and to promote genuine understanding between nations.
11. Neither the use nor the learning and teaching of any language may be wilfully suppressed or prohibited.

A d d e n d u m.
These rights and freedoms shall apply to all persons. Provision for those to whom they have hitherto not applied, should be made through home, community, further, adult or higher education.

---

*The Workshop on Human Rights and Languages was organized after the XVIIth FIPLV World Congress on August 15 and 16, 1993 in Pécs. This text, a part of a larger report, was formulated by Edward Batley, then President of the World Federation of Modern Language Associations [FIPLV], in the name of a Federation.

LESSONS FOR EASTERN EUROPE FROM LANGUAGE POLICY IN AFRICA(1)

Josef Schmied

As new challenges for Eastern Europe emerge, guide-lines, parallels and models may be considered desirable, in language policy as in many other ways of life. The following contribution offers some basic facts and statements about language policies in Africa as an input for discussions on their applicability and/or desirability for Eastern Europe. Later it reports on some research experience from Africa that might prove useful for Eastern Europe, because language policy decisions there, as elsewhere, should be based on empirical foundations.

1. AFRICA AND EASTERN EUROPE, A LEGITIMATE AND USEFUL COMPARISON?

First of all, it has to be mentioned that a comparison of Africa and Eastern Europe should be taken with caution. It goes without saying that the relationship between Eastern and Western Europe has a long-standing, detailed and complex history. That between Europe and Africa is much shorter and should thus in theory be different. The comparison seems however justified in practice today as in Germany at least many recipes for "development work" are indeed transferred, e.g. most of the governmental financial aid is organized through the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau.

As far as language is concerned, there are clear parallels between Africa and Eastern Europe in the flexibility of their sociocultural units, of which language is a major part. In this respect it is important to note that the two major purposes of communication, the linguistic, i.e. to convey information, and the sociolinguistic, i.e. to identify participants in their individual and social contexts, may be working in different directions in Eastern Europe. The informational aspect correlates with the increased flow of goods and information, with the growing integration of Eastern Europe into the common European economy, irrespective of whether it is formally integrated into the European Union or not. This favours commercially "useful" lingua francas like English or German. The identity aspect correlates, at least partly, with the increasing demands of and for smaller ethnic units and growing national(istic) self-sufficiency. This favours culturally important ethnic or national languages like Slovak or Croatian. The need to reconcile both trends, despite external and internal forces pulling in either direction, maybe a guiding principle in language as in other spheres of life. But in these matters again language is probably more likely to reflect societal developments than create them.

The comparison between Eastern Europe and Africa may also appear unfair in as far as Africa is these days no longer really associated with "development". This correlates with the widely-held opinion that not much has changed in Francophone and in Anglophone Africa, that in language policy, as in many other aspects of life, continuation of the colonial heritage and colonial practice (if not theory) seems

paramount. This can partly be explained by the fact that all the official and national languages were introduced before or during colonial times and that a relatively stable pattern of multilingualism has emerged. Seeing inequalities and imbalances in parts of this pattern, many scholars interested in language policies had hoped for more radical changes after independence and were disappointed that practical necessities or continued internal and external domination seem to have prevented these from taking place. This view may be justified in many cases, but it tends to overlook the general advantages of such stable patterns of multilingualism, a social and linguistic fact which is far more wide-spread in Africa than in Western and Eastern Europe.

2. CHANGING LANGUAGE PATTERNS IN AFRICA: TWO CASE STUDIES

In this context it may be pointed out that there are at least two African nations where there has indeed been a lot of change in recent years due to an active national language policy, namely Tanzania and Namibia. The changes in both involve English, but movement is in opposite directions, one where another language (Kiswahili) is promoted, possibly at the expense of English, the other where the intention is to reduce the use of another language, Afrikaans, in favour of English. They can therefore be taken as case studies of how official language policies can make an impact on actual patterns of language use and attitudes.

2.1. Tanzania - an anti-English case?

Tanzania has for a long time been characterized by its trifocal language pattern of English + Kiswahili + one of the national, i.e. ethnicity-related, languages (2). Since independence, the most thriving element among these languages has been Kiswahili - expanding in both directions. Although the great success ofKiswahili has always been associated with the fact that it has replaced English in many spheres of life (administration, jurisdiction and education), the "reverse side of the coin" should not be neglected, the impact of Kiswahili on the ethnicity-related languages (c.f. Mekacha 1993). The major factor in this spread of Kiswahili has been Tanzania's official language policy, of particular significance since the late 1960s when the country was driven by a nation-wide movement towards self-reliance. The spirit in which this national campain towards Kiswahili was carried out can be seen in the following editorial in one of the leading national newspapers of the country:

> NATIONAL LANGUAGE
> The call made yesterday by the Second Vice-President Mr. Rashidi Kawawa, that Tanzania's national language, Kiswahili should henceforth be strictly used for all government business is a most timely act which will give unprecedented inspiration to all Tanzanians.
>
> A nation without a national language which is not very much cared for and respected is a crazy nation. Such a state of affairs cannot be tolerated in Tanzania.
>
> Government conducts its business in the interests of the nation. To conduct such vital business in a foreign language is insulting to the nation. In

> fact to conduct such government business in language that is understood only by a handful of people is a negation of such national interest since all government business is in the service of the people who should thoroughly understand it. (The NATIONALIST 5/1/67: 2).

The processes involved on all levels of public language use (administration, education, jurisdiction, etc.) have been documented extensively (cf. Schmied 1985). This Kiswahilization is a continuing process, contrary to recent opinions of "concerned" Kiswahili supporters (Lwaitama/Rugemalira 1989). The emphasis on good English teaching, implemented for over ten years now, cannot be seen as reversing the trend, but rather as complementing the trend towards Kiswahili. With the establishment of the national language, Kiswahili, the country's international language, English, had been neglected even as a subject in its secondary schools despite its obvious importance for world-wide economic and developmental cooperation. In sociolinguistic terms it proves the trend from English as a Second to English as an International Language. The British Council supported project "English in Tanzanian Secondary Schools" aims at establishing a new level of proficiency on a modern ELT basis (Schmied 1991).

Whatever the opinions concerning the success of this policy, the fact remains that, as a result, language patterns in Tanzania have changed considerably and the nation-wide communication patterns have been aided by the truly national lingua franca, Kiswahili, which may well have contributed to the political and social stability of the country since independence. Thus seeing the Tanzanian language policy as ultimately anti-English is not entirely justified. The emphasis was clearly pro-Kiswahili and results have proved this approach right. The major problem now seems to lie in the attempt to keep the balance right. Whereas English has indeed been neglected dramatically in the past, the latest emphasis on ELT may be a (last) attempt at having one's cake and eating it.

2.2. Namibia - a pro-English case?

An even more recent case of significant national language policy is Namibia. Although a national language policy was formulated as early as 1980 (United Nations 1981), political developments, which finally led to the country's independence in 1990, only allowed its implementation very recently. This made a slight reformulation of its language policy necessary, the criteria of which have been propagated by the Ministry of Education (1993: 65):

> All national languages are equal regardless of the number of speakers or the level of development of a particular language.
> All language policies must be sensitive to this principle.
> All language policies must consider the cost of implementation.
> All language policies must regard language as a medium of cultural transmission.
> For pedagogical reasons it is ideal for children to study through their own language during the early years of schooling when basic skills of reading, writing, and concept formation are developed.
> Proficiency in the official language at the end of the 7-year primary cycle

should be sufficient to enable all children to be effective participants in society or to continue their education.

Language policy should promote national unity.

Despite these idealistic goals, the country has already been critized for its implementation policy, which appears to put too much emphasis on English at the expense of African languages. Supporters of the national language policy maintain that this is absolutely necessary because of the overwhelming dominance of Afrikaans, an assertion which surprised many SWAPO supporters returning from their bases in "English- speaking" countries such as Zambia. Critics of this policy claim that this could suppress African languages more than ever before. Others maintain that even if the policy is basically directed against Afrikaans, its more immediate effect is against German, which has a long-standing educational and commercial tradition in the country and against French, which is necessary for the country's growing new international links. And over the entire debate the heritage of apartheid looms and threatens to embitter the relations, because anti-English campaigners have to dissociate themselves from the pro-Afrikaans.

In general, Namibia could, like Tanzania, be seen as a nation with a trifocal language pattern of English + Afrikaans + national languages. The major difference from the Tanzanian pattern is that historically English has been and still is a very weak partner and Afrikaans tends to influence/dominate the languages at both ends of the spectrum. The general disappointment over the weak position of English among the SWAPO leadership has already led to their accepting a pragmatic compromise. Thus regarding the Namibian language policy as a blunt case of pro-English policy, as is often claimed, is not entirely justified. The emphasis has to beseen in the general political context, which includes an ideological contrast (capitalism versus modified socialism), a regional contrast (the Ovambo dominated North versus the South African looking South) and many others. In such situations nothing but a compromise can ensure peaceful linguistic and cultural development - but it is far too early to see where, in concrete terms, the compromise will lie. Even in Namibia, with its rich development potential new sociolinguistic patterns will take a little longer to emerge.

3. LESSONS FOR LANGUAGE POLICY DECISIONS FROM AFRICA

What can these two case studies show in more general terms for language policy? Although many local conditions have to be considered as essential cultural factors determining the success or failure of new language patterns, the fact that Africa has experienced such a variety of language political decisions and attempts means that it can be seen as a laboratory or place of simulation or experimentation. On this basis we can venture some hypotheses:

First, language policy changes can only be successful if integrated in larger sociopolitical changes (cf. Ujamaa in Tanzania and independence/nation building in Namibia).

Second, there can be a marked contrast between national government policy and individual choice of language users. The complex interplay of factors to be considered and the persistence of the existing language patterns should not be underestimated.

Third, one basic asset is the African multilingual tradition. Trilingual patterns

including mother-tongue, regional and international lingua francas are the rule rather than the exception. The view to Africa in this respect coincides with a view back in its own history for Eastern Europe, even though the practical difficulties should not be underestimated in both cases. Special attempts have to be made, however, to create or maintain such multilingualism at a satisfactory level. It is only in such a multilingual context that linguistic human rights on all levels (cf. Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1994a and Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas 1994) can be achieved.

Finally, it has to be remembered that NO language policy, i.e. a maintainance of the status quo and a laisser-faire of market forces, is also a language policy - but probably not the socially best one.

4. LESSONS FROM SOCIOLINGUISTIC FIELDWORK AS A BASIS FOR LANGUAGE POLICY DECISIONS

A further parallel between the newly awakened nations in Eastern Europe today and in Africa in the 1960s is the lack of reliable empirical language data. For language planning decisions should be based on a solid sociolinguistic basis. The most famous attempt to provide such a basis was the Survey of language use and language teaching in Eastern Africa (SLULTEA), which was carried out between 1968 and 1972 in Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia. One of its basic ideas was research collaboration between foreign "experts" and local specialists and students on the macro- and the microlevel, in research planning as well as in actualfieldwork. This was to ensure a longstanding transfer of sociolinguistic research experience from the North (basically America) to the South. Admittedly, the SLULTEA had its weaknesses (cf. Fox 1975), data were lost, the general impact on official language planning left much to be desired, the spread-effects in the African research community were limited, and so on. These weaknesses were partly caused by general development problems in the countries surveyed, partly by the contrast between rich and poor researchers, partly by political turmoils, etc. And still, the methods developed can be applied in similar sociolinguistic contexts, the data available now can serve as a reference point for future research and the fruits of the basic input are still harvested in many universities in Eastern Africa (without which input the situation would certainly be much worse).

Our two case studies Tanzania and Namibia have a different position towards such a sociolinguistic survey: Tanzania was part of one - albeit 25 years ago, Namibia is planning one (as it could not be included for political reasons then).

A similar survey in Eastern Europe could have equally positive, possibly even more positive effects, not only in the narrow linguistic sense, but also in the wider cultural sense. In the narrow linguistic sense it could be more than a data-levying exercise, because it could include many socially relevant questions of language needs in various regions, social groups and communication contexts and because it could provide many empirical guidelines for corpus planning (of local and regional languages) and status planning (of all languages, including the international languages of English, French and German, in economic and educational systems). In the wider cultural scene a survey could demonstrate that language and language planning in the widest sense do matter in a modern multinational and multilingual Europe, that linguists and their research can make a contribution towards economic, social and cultural development and that Europeanization does not necessarily mean a loss of linguistic identity, but may be

an expansion of it.

5. A PROPOSAL FOR A SMALL-SCALE SURVEY OF LANGUAGE NEEDS

The lowest level of such a sociolinguistic survey could be integrated into the training of students at universities. As part of their practical application of theoretical principles of language planning and sociolinguistics in general, students could analyse language policy statements, conduct expert interviews, design, admininister, process and interpret questionnaires, and so on. This could also lead to closer cooperation of language departments with schools, offices and business companies, which could have two advantages:

- first, it might make all these bodies aware of the role language and language planning (could) play in society, and
- second, it would provide students with some realistic hands-on teaching experience that might even be useful for the students' future careers, and that type of practical teaching in sociolinguistics would in any case be much more useful than unrealistic simulations of systems in the classroom alone.

In our own immediate environment, in Saxony, such practical field work could consist of a supply and demand analysis: The demand could be investigated in open interviews with staffmanagers of various business companies on the importance of language skills in their recruitment policy and with various other managers on their international language requirements or in discussions with federal and state institutions on anticipated language needs in educational and administrative planning. The supply could be assessed on an individual basis by administering questionnaires to various population groups and on an educational basis by analysing theoretical language requirements and practical language skills at different school levels. Such an independent and empirical study could also be used either to evaluate suggestions from funding organizations (cf. the critical position vis-a-vis such educational "aid" by Phillipson 1992) and to counteract them or to put them on a more realistic basis. Incorporated into a larger programme of cooperation among language planners and sociolinguists (possibly supported by the European Union), such research would also ensure a transfer of research methodology and experience for both sides, "Western" and "Eastern".

Thus we may conclude that there are indeed important lessons to be learnt from language policies and language policy research in Africa for Eastern Europe and these lessons will not just open our eyes to the mistakes of the past but give guidelines and inspiration for the future.

Notes:

1. The fieldwork for this comparison has been supported by the special research programme on "Identity in Africa" at the University of Bayreuth (SFB 214). I am grateful to my research partners in Africa, particularly in Tanzania and Namibia. I also wish to thank numerous discussants from (Central and) Eastern Europe in Bayreuth and Chemnitz for their constructive comments on some of the views expressed here.

2. The terminology for the various official and co- or semi- official languages varies (cf. Schmied 1991: 24ff) and reflects personal or governmental language attitudes. Ideally, the first language is the nation's first international language with essential importance in at least some public spheres of life (e.g. jurisdiction, government administration), the second language is the nation-wide, accepted lingua franca, the third has at least a regional (or social) stronghold, where it is used in broadcasting or other mass communication. What is more important as a political issue, however, are the social implications and sociolinguistic hierarchies in this pattern.

THE SPREAD OF DOMINANT LANGUAGES (ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN) IN MULTILINGUAL EUROPE

Robert Phillipson

The British Foreign Minister greeted the fall of the iron curtain by proclaiming that **English** should become the first foreign language throughout eastern and central Europe, the lingua franca of changed times. In British official rhetoric, Britain symbolizes for the former communist states of Europe "liberal democracy, the free market and, above all, the English language" (Chairman's Introduction to the British Council Annual Report, 1991-92, 2).

Adherence to free market principles does not mean that language policy, language spread and the formation of linguistic hierarchies is left to chance (see Phillipson 1994). The first European state to build up an empire, Spain, was advised in 1492 by Nebrija, in a seminal language planning document, that Castilian **Spanish** was "a tool for conquest abroad and a weapon to suppress untutored speech at home... language has always been the consort of empire and forever shall remain its mate" (quoted in Illich 1981, 35). The results of this policy can be seen throughout what came to be called the Americas.

French has for centuries been actively construed as the language of reason and logic (ce qui n'est pas clair, n'est pas français) and human rights. It has been, and still is, energetically promoted at home and abroad, with the advantage, for researchers interested in such matters, of massive documentation of official policy and legislation.

The German government regards the international use of the **German** language as a major strategic concern, with, for instance, the use of German in international organizations and the presence of German as a foreign language on school time-tables seen as direct correlates of the power and the perceived economic and political potential of the German-speaking countries. In European Union institutions, the case for German having the same rights as French and German and playing an equally important role, is being advanced strongly.

A **historical** perspective is important to bear in mind, as we tend to accept that linguistic hierarchies nationally and internationally are somehow natural and God-given. In particular, speakers of dominant languages tend to be insensitive to the rights of minority languages. We know from history that many factors influence how languages rise and fall. At the time when Castilian Spanish was being launched on the world scene, English was spoken by approximately the same number of people as currently speak Danish, and was regarded as unsuitable for scientific writing. English expanded worldwide, and one of the founding fathers of the American Revolution, John Adams, wrote in 1780:

> "English is destined to be in the next and succeeding centuries more generally the language of the world than Latin was in the last or French is in the present age. The reason for this is obvious, because the

> increasing population in America, and their universal connection and correspondence with all nations will, aided by the influence of England in the world, whether great or small, force their language ito general use..." (quoted in McCrum et al 1986, 239).

In the mid-19th century English was being imagined (in Benedict Anderson's sense of the modern nation state as an imagined community) as

> "a strong, a harmonious, a noble language... Before another century has gone by it will, at the present rate of increase, be spoken by hundreds of millions... That language is rapidly becoming the great medium of civilization, the language of law and literature to the Hindoo, of commerce to the African, of religion to the scattered islands of the Pacific." (Edwin Guest, 1838, quoted in Crowley 1989, 71-72).

The more the British extended the boundaries of their empire, the more the English language was praised as a superior language and was subjected to extensive study (Crowley 1989, 71). The grammar of English was regarded as being peculiarly useful for training the mind of the African and Indian.

Contemporary Africans and Indians, whatever their class background and standard of living, appreciate that command of English provides access to power, influence and wealth, by a process of what Braj Kachru has vividly described as the "alchemy of English". The demand for English is real enough in post-communist states for similar reasons, and one might wonder why there is any justification for being sceptical about meeting this demand. Is there anything to be worried about?

The important question is **what role language is playing in links between western and eastern Europe**. Whose interests are being served when the French and the Germans, the British and the Americans seek to promote their language in former communist countries? That they are not doing so for exclusively altruistic reasons is abundantly clear from official rhetoric. Noble purposes have in recent decades been partially displaced by cruder commercial interests: "là où on parle français, on achête français". Language and economic interests are inextricably linked: francophonie has to do with commerce and culture (Haut Conseil de la Francophonie 1993, 495). English for business is big business for the English, literally a billion dollar business. English language classes worldwide are now a source of income for the British Council, saving the British government money. The British Council's activities worldwide serve the over-riding purpose of "promoting Britain's international standing and influence through cultural relations and development aid... The global spread of the English language is fundamental to Britain's trade, culture and development." (Annual Report 1992/3, 10, 12).

The investment by the **American** state and private foundations in establishing English worldwide, particularly from 1950 to 1970, was "perhaps the most ever spent in history in support of the propagation of a language" (Troike 1977, 2). This investment has effectively facilitated and protected Western interests and investments worldwide, particularly in former colonies. Language plays a vital role in constituting and servicing North-South links.

The issue then is what the position of language is in West-East links. There are many analogies between eastern and central Europe in the 1990s and **"Third World"**

countries: acute economic and social problems, investment and aid being made conditional on vaguely defined principles of "democracy" and respect for human rights, unequal terms of trade (Tomaševski 1993). The evidence from virtually all former colonies is that the underdeveloped world has remained dependent on the former colonial languages both for external relations and as the dominant language internally (Phillipson 1992). It seems highly likely that the language policies followed in postcolonial societies have served the interests of North far better than the South, in particular the masses in South countries. There are parallels between economic and linguistic underdevelopment. Use of dominant western European languages (English in Nigeria, French in Senegal, etc.) has prevented local languages from going through the extension of range and repertoire that many European languages went through as recently as in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite many obvious differences between the "Second" and "Third" worlds (in particular in post-communist states the existence of well-established national languages, and substantial experience of managing multilingualism in the education system), the relevant question to ask is whether a similar pattern of economic and linguistic dependence will evolve in former communist states (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1994b).

Use of the term **linguistic imperialism** in a rigorous sense, rather than as a mere slogan, presupposes that there is an unequal, assymetrical relationship between the parties, that one language thrives at the expense of the other (Phillipson 1992). This was clearly the case in the Soviet Union, with Russian structurally favoured, and bilingualism seen as the progressive replacement of other languages by Russian (Rannut 1994). Within Britain and the United States, English has prospered at the expense of other languages, though both indigenous and immigrant languages tenaciously refuse to disappear. Similarly with French and the other languages of France in the consolidation of the nation state. This model was exported worldwide to countries colonised by Europeans, and the pattern has remained in place in virtually all postcolonial contexts.

In linguistic imperialism, **the dominance of a given language is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between that language and other languages**. Here **structural** refers broadly to material properties (for example institutions, financial allocations) and **cultural** to immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes and beliefs). Asymmetrical exploitation involves language learning and language use being subtractive rather than additive, for instance when competence in a dominant language entails the marginalization and loss of others. This often occurs with minority languages.

At the supranational level, similar processes may well be involved in relation to the "small" or "lesser used" European languages, for instance Danish in European Union institutions. There is likely to be structural favouring of one language, for instance its use as a working language, often accompanied by a belief that some languages are less worthy, less functional, less prestigious than others. The issue of the rights of particular languages in the conduct of European business is central to the functioning of supranational institutions, and to democratic insight into and participation in decision-making. As the European Union expands and admits new members, this issue will become more salient.

In contemporary Europe, dominance is less imposed by military force, and more by ideological means, persuasion and attitudes, combined with structural favouring within key domains of social reproduction, not least in the education system. This means that language policy is not only the concern of the state. Also involved, explicitly or

implicitly, in making language choices are **media** organizations, public and private, national and international. **Business** enterprises may select an 'international' language as the in-company language. The **scientific** community operates in a variety of languages, and the tendency is for English increasingly to dominate. Western states follow a policy of universities attracting substantial numbers of **foreign students** (who are a source of income), in the hope that such people will be influential and friendly later in life. There are 80,000 in Britain, but this figure represents only 6% of the world market for foreign students, 8% of whom are in Germany, 13% in France and 35% in the US. Individual **higher education** institutions may decide that an "international language" should not serve merely as a library language (English already serves this purpose throughout higher education in Denmark), but should be used as the medium of education. Here this university is at the forefront, and whether it is promoting linguistic imperialism is an empirical question that has not been seriously addressed.

Analysis of language policy decisions in a range of such social domains should aim at uncovering the underlying trends, at identifying the overall structure and its ideological underpinning. The issues are certainly not simple. Linguistic hegemony is complex at several levels. For instance, the French are directly involved in strengthening French internally and externally. But they are promoting the use of French while simultaneously advocating policies which address the multilingual realities of the contemporary world. Thus the Minister for Francophonie is currently urging European governments to reflect together on "how European multilingualism can be developed, how to generalize and diversify the learning of the languages of Europe... without the reductionist intermediary of an "international" language" (Le Monde, 24/2/1994).

This last comment is an indirect reference to the perceived threat to all languages from the increasing use of English. There is a purist streak in it, so that one might rephrase Rivarol's 18th century dictum as "ce qui n'est pas clair, c'est l'anglais international". There is no doubt that the obligation to express oneself optimally in a second language can represent a limitation of one's communicative competence. This probably plays a significant role in negotiations in Brussels, and is of more than anecdotal significance. The personal competence of the multilingual in "international" or "transglossic" contexts needs though to be considered separately from the issue, which I shall not go into here, of "global" standards or norms for a language, and the fact that English, like French, is not one language but several, with different variants in Europe and North America, in Africa, Asia, etc.

The French urge for French to be used widely, which can be seen for instance in substantial efforts to consolidate **French in eastern Europe** (for instance by direct support for the teaching of French, along the same lines as the activities of the Americans, British and Germans, e.g. the use of French as the medium of education in a faculty in Petersburg) is thus partly inspired by free market competition with English and German. It was the Germans and French who were behind the LINGUA programme which aims at encouraging the learning of a wide range of languages in European schools, which means that Danish and Dutch are taught occasionally as a foreign language, and Spanish more, and a policy of two foreign languages will result in vast numbers of young Europeans learning French or German as well as English. Seen from a Scandinavian perspective, this is all to the good, particularly if the quality of language learning and cultural understanding can be improved, and more products of the education system are functionally multilingual.

French efforts in this area are useful, because in Europe generally, little effort

has been made to engage in multilingual language planning, though many bodies (like the Council of Europe and the European Parliament) are involved. The British and Americans by contrast tend to act on the principle that if English is good enough for them, it is good enough for the entire world. French efforts, even if they are ambivalent, do have the merit of putting language policy on the agenda.

Whether their policy involves any more fundamental questioning of the nature of linguistic imperialism, and the "rights" of dominant languages is another matter. Clearly French activity in this area is in part motivated by an urge to combat the linguistic imperialism of English. And, as can be seen in the key significance of language laws in the disintegration phase of the Soviet Union, resistance to linguistic imperialism can be a powerful force. French efforts reflect an awareness that the structure of "internationalisation", for instance in the scientific world, is not arbitrary but reflects policies followed since 1945, in particular by the dominant power, the USA. French language policy documents rightly point out that the promotion of one language, French, as a global language, will only succeed if it is sensitive to multilingual realities. It is therefore these underlying realities and structures that need analysis.

It is also possible that states which have just escaped from Stalinism, in which language was an important dimension of both oppression and liberation, may be in a good position to resist linguistic imperialism, through the formation of appropriate language policies which build on an awareness of the underlying structures and ideologies. This presupposes though that states such as Estonia or Hungary, like Denmark and France, are free to make language policy decisions freely and independently. Here the paradox is that it is precisely the international functions that language performs that means that it is false to see language policy as a matter that the state can decide on internally. Language knows no borders, however much the nation-state has attempted to impose the norm of one nation, one state, one language. To paraphrase the 16th century English poet, John Donne, whose imagery is peculiarly appropriate for analysis of English and European language policy,

> No man is an Island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main.
>
> No language is an Island, entire of itself: every language is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main.

The diversity of the continent, the mainland, is the starting-point. Language is one constituent of the social relations between its parts, nationally and internationally, in a world where linguistic hierarchies are a fact. What we are exploring is the constitution of these hierarchies and whose interests they and we serve.

DOMINANT "INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGES" IN EUROPE

Claude Truchot

Concepts

The concepts generally used in this context, such as **international language**, **dominant language**, **language spread**, will be evaluated.

History

Though the research will deal mainly with the present situation, it is important to have a historical overview of the spread of languages such as English, French, German, Russian in Europe, and particularly to collect bibliographical references.

Factors of language spread

As for all new fields, a lot of the existing research is still empirical, but attempts have been made to elaborate theoretical foundations. Robert Phillipson (1992) has inserted the concept of language spread within a framework for the study of linguistic imperialism. Alma Rubal-Lopez, following Fishman, has taken an analytical approache looking for variables. Claude Truchot (1990) has devised the concept of **transglossie** to describe the linguistic situations of communities where a language is being spread without answering needs internal to this community and obviously without any geographical basis.

These approaches are more complementary than contradictory, but there is a need for confrontation and going deeper. There is also an urgent need for studies on languages other than English, as almost all research has been carried out on this language (but see Ammon 1991). This is necessary from a theoretical point of view, as the theory of language spread should encompass all languages (see the two numbers of the **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, 95 (1992) and 107 (1994).

Studies of languages other than English are also particularly relevant for issues of language policy. As an example, for lack of research, no-one is able to tell at the moment what are the dynamics behind the spread of the French language.

Among the themes for future research are the following:

- the influence of internationalization of the economy, exchanges, society, in relation to technological changes, particularly in fields such as communication and information;
- the influence and action of mother tongue countries, or as Braj Kachru (19xx) puts it more rightly, of "inner circles", i.e. countries where the language has national and official status and is also largely a native language (for example the global dominance of U.S. cultural products);
- influence and action of outer circles (Commonwealth and other "anglophone"

countries, francophonie);

- the promotion of languages by institutions (the British Council, Alliance Française, Goethe Institut). Though it is a part of the action and influence of the inner circles, special attention has to be devoted to this particular aspect.
- the teaching of "international languages" as foreign languages;

Consequences of language spread

- Linguistic hierarchies, and relationships between competing dominant languages (for example, up to what point each language takes advantage of the process of internationalization);
- Use and status in institutions (private companies, international institutions, NGOs, conferences);
- Circulation: databases, publications (books, scientific and specialized journals), press agencies, newspapers and magazines, TV programmes, satellites, cable networks, cultural products (songs), information (labelling of goods, instructions for use, technical documents);
- Attitudes towards the spread of these languages, including factors of variation.

Language policies

Language policies can be defensive (limits put to the use of English in some countries), global ("European multilingualism"), specific (The Dutch National Action Programme on Foreign Languages).

Area studies

A particular attention will be devoted to the situation in Central and Eastern Europe where German, English, Russian and even French are competing and where changes are very fast. Other areas will also be considered, like the European Union and Nordic countries, together with specific countries.

LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mart Rannut

Language policy in the Baltic states Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania has been the object of monitoring by missions of several international organizations, among them the UN, CSCE, Council of Europe, as well as international NGOs like the Minority Rights Group, Human Rights Watch, International Helsinki Federation, etc. The reason for the concern has been the alleged discrimination against the Russian-speaking population residing in the Baltic states.

The term Russian-speaking population refers in this context not only to Russians, but also other minor ethnic groups, who prefer to use Russian rather than Estonian when communicating with the authorities. The history of these group varies in each Baltic country. Before World War II, the Russians comprised 8% of the population in Estonia, in Latvia 25%, and in Lithuania their number was marginal. During the war the Soviet Union occupied the countries, and after the war in 1945 transferred parts of Estonia and Latvia which had a significant Russian minority to Russia. As a result, after the casualties of war and the border shift, the size of the Russian minority was marginal in all 3 Baltic countries (e.g. in Estonia less than 3%).

During the occupation of these countries, there was huge immigration from Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. In consequence, Estonian nationals were according to the 1989 census reduced to 61% of the population, and Latvians in Latvia to slightly over half. The eight largest cities in Latvia had a Russian majority, including Riga the capital. Lithuania was affected much less by immigration, being confined mostly to Mazhekiai, Ignalina and Klaipeda. There was a particular problem in Lithuania caused by Polish minority in and around Vilnius, who were less immune to russification. As a result, many of them became strong supporters of the Soviet Union and joined Russian-minded anti-Lithuanian organizations.

The most harmful legacy for the Baltic countries is that the newcomers were prevented from integrating into the societies concerned. Instead, a hostile monolingual Russian-speaking and Russian-minded population was created, with an infrastructure of their own and Russian functioning as the majority language.

The Baltic states regained their independence in August 1991. The linguistic normalisation of societies with totalitarian habits was initiated by the passing of Language Laws with firm administrative back-up. In Estonia, in order to regulate the linguistic process and implement language policy, the National Language Board was created. Equivalent functions were given to the State Language Centre in Latvia and the Department of Nationalities in Lithuania (this was reorganized as the Department of Regional problems and National Minorities in 1994.) In addition, a Language Commission was formed under the Cultural Heritage Inspectorate of Lithuania, the main tasks of which are the regulation and control of signs, ads and other carriers of text. The Latvian Language Centre focuses on adult language teaching and official usage control. In Estonia, language planning has been implemented most effectively. In status planning, the main activities of the Board are drafting and implementing legal acts regulating the functional and regional restructuring of the official usage of languages.

The work is done on the spot by language inspectors who control the implementation of the two constitutional rights: the right of everyone to be served in Estonian, meaning the requirement that holders of retail and service jobs are able to speak Estonian when communicating with the public; and the requirement that all legal entities use Estonian in official communications that are controlled by the state according to law (e.g. book-keeping). The Board is also engaged in corpus planning activities, like geographical, personal and firm name regulation, terminology standardisation, the verification of official translations, linguistic expertise in court, linguistic standard setting (e.g. the ASCII code for Estonian õ), conducting sociolinguistic research, and monitoring. In acquisition planning, the main activities are connected to providing expert aid for the Ministry of Education by evaluating teaching programs, reviewing teaching materials, testing and training language examiners for employment and citizenship.

Besides the direct influence on the language(s) conducted through language planning, there is noteworthy indirect influence. This is related to a variety of financial, administrative and political factors. For example, in Estonia several financial matters like loan and investment policies (often equipped with regulations) and the behaviour of transnational and other foreign companies, also influence language. The administrative factors in licensing policies for jobs and in media policy (e.g. distribution of radio frequencies, regulations for producing TV programs and transmitting satellite programs) and political factors (e.g. the registration of political organisations, naturalisation of political partners by "special merits") do the same. The direct and indirect activities together form the core of the language policy of the state.

Though hard work is done and positive developments can be seen in the language policies in the Baltics, one can hardly feel satisfied. The reason for this is the more visible dimension that takes one straight to foreign policy. The pressure from the Russian Federation, which claims the right to protect her citizens, and assumes that the requirement of a knowledge of the Estonian language for employment and citizenship is a violation of human rights for her citizens, has made the Estonian authorities cautious, and has delayed the pace of normalisation. The developments are best and accusations least in Lithuania, with an insignificant number of Russians to take care of. The reverse is true in Latvia, and Estonia is modestly intermediate. Though no international human rights mission has traced any gross or systematic violation of such rights, this has not stopped Russia from carrying on a campaign for domestic purposes (Zhirinovsky!). Simultaneously in politics-free areas [grass-root level, administrative-type agreements (recognition of diplomas, heritage issues etc.)], developments have been consistent and productive.

To forecast, one can envisage qualitatively improved results by the year 2000 and a linguistically normalized society (with the titular language functioning as the official language with loyal bilingual minorities in a legal framework of cultural autonomy) by the next generation. But even then and later, there will be some neighbour state complaining about discrimination in the Baltic states.

EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGES IN MULTILINGUAL CENTRAL EUROPE

Zsófia Radnai

The age of political transition brought about a transition in language education too, as the hegemony of Russian was replaced in 1989 by a wide, and at many educational establishments free choice of languages offered to the learners. Russian became one of the Slavic languages in the region, though naturally the most widely spread one (Radnai 1994).

When the chance of quitting the learning of Russian was offered, most parents, children, young adults and schools took it eagerly, and for two years Russian seemed to totally disappear from the curriculum (for statistics for Hungary, see Radnai 1994). Since then there has been an observable return: many learners who started with this language are taking it up again, and the learning of Russian is gradually stabilizing at the level of French.

The frame of language policy could transmit experiences and maybe international (regional, European) norms, but educational language policy must be decided within the State. The role of the State could also be revised as there can be different school systems within the same country: national (central), state financed; regional and private. The system of church schools has been returning everywhere. These various systems may have their own preferences (based on historical, cultural, political, religious, geographical, and economic arguments).

An example: in the South-West of Hungary (Pécs and region), because of the geographical and historical situation, Croatian is offered as a medium of education for the minority population, and it is also present a lot more strongly as a second/foreign language than anywhere else in the country. The language is spoken and used also in business more than the Hungarian average (Radnai & Koster, forthcoming).

Educational language policy is also influenced by research, e.g. research in language acquisition. This field was for a long time characterized by a heavy stress on the official 'first' language (Russian), sometimes for apologetic purposes, sometimes with the aim of improving the level and effectiveness of its teaching. Then, in the early 1980s a new trend appeared, and the focus was gradually shifting towards languages other than Russian, and especially their early start.

The growth of interest of researchers gave a very apparent impetus to the early start programmes themselves, basically because the research activity centered around action research, containing syllabus design, in-service teacher training, materials writing. This proved to be a field where the latest findings of language acquisition research could find their direct way into classroom practice - a very rare phenomenon in language teaching (Radnai, forthcoming; Nikolov 1994).

A laissez-faire attitude in the choice of foreign languages to be taught in schools

would result in simply substituting Russian by English or German. Therefore some theses are necessary for the orientation of decision makers.

Thesis 1: more than one foreign language is needed in the schools of Central and East European countries, whose languages all belong to the category of 'less taught' languages of Europe (which actually means they are not of a world-wide distribution, with the exception of Austria).

This is necessary for several reasons:

a) all the respective countries have an open economy, so their survival depends on building up solid international relations in the economy as well as culture and education.

b) most of them used to belong to the block of communist countries where the intended lingua franca, Russian, failed to fulfill the role it was supposed to take, whereas the relations and interdependence of these smaller nation states have been very close for centuries.

The consequence of these two factors is that the people in this region need the knowledge of at least one language of world-wide distribution to keep them in contact with the rest of Europe and the world, and at least one language of the immediate environment to maintain and develop the bi- and multi-lateral relationships within the region.

The choice of languages to be offered in schools has to correlate with the national, regional and local needs. These needs have to be analysed carefully in each individual case. In some of the countries like Hungary and Slovakia, there have been several attempts made in order to assess the existing and expected needs. In the business community of Hungary (Teemant, Varga, Heltai, 1993) it is apparently German which is the most widely used and studied foreign language due to a) the geographical closeness of German speaking countries which results partly in manifold direct contacts, and also the mediation of overseas enterprises through German and Austrian companies; b) as well as the historical traditions (several hundred years of coexistence within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy). Though German does take an overwhelming first position, in overall language use English is not lagging far behind at all. In many fields (e.g. science and development) it is obviously the most important foreign language, which is not surprising considering the very similar state of affairs in the whole of Europe.

If we accept the above stated thesis, we need to make a further step to establish when and in what order the two (or more) languages should be introduced in public education. As mentioned previously, research has yielded quite a significant amount of data on the early start of second language learning, especially that of English and Russian, but unfortunately almost nothing is available on the second problem, the order of languages to study, although some research activity has started on the topic lately, with several age groups, especially concerning the order of Germanic languages (English, German, Dutch).

Thesis 2 offers two varieties for the solution of ordering the set of languages.

According to the **first** variety, English or German should be started (in the primary school from the 4th grade or at the secondary level), and the other one, the remaining one of the two or any one of the set of French, Italian, Spanish should follow later. This version may also include the continuation of the first foreign language, or the simultaneous start of the two at secondary level. It is supported by traditions, the availability of teaching staff and materials.

The **second** variety would offer a start of any of the less taught languages at the

primary level, and start the study of English or German after the age of 12. There are several arguments to support this version:

a) this would give a better chance for local preferences (including the languages of the neighbouring country or the minorities; c.f. Radnai 1994);
b) the first foreign language has an advantage and disadvantage at the same time, namely one is learning how to learn a language besides acquiring a new idiom;
c) social (horizontal, geographical) mobility increases after the age of 12 when a nationwide system may become more necessary.

In the case of either variety the system of continuation, maintenance and practice should be provided, for example in the form of clubs, exchange of pupils, specialized (cultural, literary) activities. This is also important for the overall socialization of the children.

Beside the outlined mainstream options, a more and more growing tendency of launching bilingual (dual language) schools or programmes has become apparent in several countries of the region. Some of them follow the Bulgarian example which has the advantage of giving a chance for gifted children all over the country to develop study (academic) skills in a foreign tongue and perhaps continue their studies abroad, in a country where the given language is spoken, and also the disadvantage of using the curriculum of the secondary schools where this language is the national language (L1) of the country, with translated textbooks. This system, wherever used, needs to be revised. Needless to say, there are also some other systems for bilingual (dual) school education which are exempts of the aforementioned deficiencies (see e.g. Duff 1991, a description of a late immersion programme in Hungary).

Pedagogy, educational science should recognise the results of linguistic research both in the fields of language acquisition and socio-linguistics. Educational language policy should consider the advice of language policy more seriously than it has done so far.

EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGES IN MULTILINGUAL WESTERN EUROPE

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

INTRODUCTION: THE EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE

When the Danish Foreign Minister speaks to the international press about "... the **so-called** Maastrich agreement...", he unintentionally implies that there was no agreement (through lexical interference from the mother tongue). When another Minister, nearing the completion of a meeting he is chairing in Brussels, says that "... the negotiations are more or less complete - all that is left is **a prick over the eye**...", his unintended obscenity may amuse some of the participants, but it is doubtful whether it seriously increases their respect for his competence.

Now these examples of non-idiomatic English could be much more serious. After all, to quote Wilfried Stölting, "a language in international use deserves all it gets". Hartmut Haberland and I wrote, with two colleagues, in the foreword of a 300-page report from RUC which we edited (a result of an international conference we organised in 1978), with participants representing many countries and mother tongues, just as at our Symposium here: "The language of the report is the responsibility of the contributors alone. Any similarity with the English language spoken and written in the U.K. or in the U.S. is purely accidental." (Dittmar, Haberland, Skutnabb-Kangas & Teleman 1978, 4).

Still we know that much higher levels of proficiency in several languages are a **sine qua non** in today's Europe and will be even more so in the future. In a recent article (in Danish; Skutnabb-Kangas 1993, 76-77) I give examples of several leading academics, business people or politicians voicing their dismay at present levels of proficiency, and, especially, the lack in Scandinavia of really high levels of proficiency in foreign languages other than English. Likewise, the European Union policy calls for more language teaching. The preamble of the decision to establish the LINGUA programme (nr. 89/489, 28.7.1989, Official Journal L239, 16.8.1989) formulates it as follows: "... the establishment of the Internal Market would be facilitated by the quantitative improvement of foreign language training within the Community to enable the Community's citizens to communicate with each other and to overcome linguistic difficulties which impede the free movement of persons, goods, services and capital."

If we want societies where polarization between groups is not going to accelerate even more rapidly and if we want just a little bit of equality, education is the institution which has to deliver the goods.

LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS FOR ALL IN EDUCATION?

Today the education of both majorities and minorities in most European and Europeanized countries functions in conflict with most scientifically sound principles about how an education leading to high levels of multilingualism should be organized.

Education participates in attempting and committing linguistic genocide in relation to many **minorities**, and certainly the bulk of immigrated minorities. In relation to linguistic **majorities**, education today in most cases deprives them of the possibility of gaining the benefits associated with really high levels of multilingualism. Present reductionist educational language choices do not support the diversity which is necessary for the planet to have a future.

In a civilized state, there is no need to debate the right to maintain and develop one's mother tongue. It is a self-evident, fundamental, basic linguistic human right (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994). Observing linguistic human rights (LHRs) implies at an **individual** level that everyone can identify positively with their mother tongue, and have that identification accepted and respected by others, irrespective of whether their mother tongue is a minority language or a majority language. It means the right to learn the mother tongue, orally and in writing, including at least basic education through the medium of the mother tongue, and the right to use it in many (official) contexts. It means the right to learn at least one of the official languages in one's country of residence. It should therefore be normal that teachers (including ESL teachers) are bilingual. Restrictions on these rights may be considered linguistic wrongs, an infringement of fundamental LHRs.

Observing LHRs implies at a **collective** level the right of minority groups to exist (i.e. the right to be "different"). It implies the right to enjoy and develop their languages and the right for minorities to establish and maintain schools and other training and educational institutions, with control of curricula and teaching in their own languages. It also involves guarantees of representation in the political affairs of the state, and the granting of autonomy to administer matters internal to the groups, at least in the fields of culture, education, religion, information, and social affairs, with the financial means, through taxation or grants, to fulfil these functions.

Many majorities enjoy most LHRs. It would be perfectly feasible to grant many of these rights to minorities, without infringing the rights of majorities. What majorities in most countries do NOT have now is the linguistic right to become really high level multilinguals through education. I want to emphasize this: Multilingual in some sense, yes, but NOT **high** level multilingual. Young Danes are among the most multilingual youngsters in Europe according to a recent survey. Their oral linguistic proficiency in English is generally high and many have a smattering of another language, either German or French, and in some cases both. Still, those who have not travelled extensively and lived in other countries for some time, i.e. those whose linguistic competence is a result of education and mass media **in Denmark only**, usually know very little of German and/or French, nothing of other languages, and their English, even if it is fair, is nowhere near the level needed for political or cultural cooperation or trade in a Federal Europe and beyond.

One of the basic linguistic human rights of persons belonging to minorities is - or should be - to achieve high levels of bi- or multilingualism through education. Becoming at least bilingual is in most cases a necessary prerequisite for minorities to exercise other fundamental human rights.

HOW SHOULD EDUCATION TOWARDS HIGH LEVELS OF MULTILINGUALISM BE ORGANIZED?

It is possible to make many different kinds of cautious generalization on how education should be organised in order to enable children and young people to become **high level multilinguals**. I have drawn conclusions about general principles on the basis of (research evidence in) several experiments. These include

- mother tongue maintenance programmes,
- immersion programmes,
- two-way programmes,
- alternate-days programmes,
- The European Schools,
- International Schools,
- early reading programmes and
- Kōhanga Reo.

In **mother tongue medium programmes for minorities**, minority children choose voluntarily to have most of their education through the medium of their mother tongue, in their own classes, with bilingual teachers, and with good teaching of a majority language as a second language, also given by bilingual teachers.

In **immersion programmes for majorities**, majority children choose voluntarily to have most of their education through the medium of a minority language, in their own classes, with bilingual teachers, and with good teaching of their mother tongue, which becomes the medium of education for some of the time later on.

In **two-way programmes for minorities and majorities**, minority and majority children study together in the same class, with a bilingual teacher, through the medium of a minority language, and study the majority language as a second language (in the case of minority children) or a mother tongue (in the case of majority children). The majority language becomes the medium of education for some of the time later on.

In **alternate-days programmes for minorities and majorities**, minority and majority children study together in the same class, with two bilingual teachers, through the medium of both languages, alternating daily, and study the majority language as a second language (minority children) or a mother tongue (majority children). The majority language becomes the medium of education for some of the time later on.

In **The European Schools**, children in every subsection (one for each European Union official language) study with their own language as the main medium of education, with an increasing number of hours spent through other languages (see below).

For presentations of the remaining programmes and details of all the programmes, see e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1988, 1990, in press, and the book **Multilingualism for All** (edited by Skutnabb-Kangas, in press).

It seems to me that the principles which have to a large extent been followed in most of those experiments which have reached the best results (i.e. high levels of bi- or multilingualism, a fair chance of success in relation to school achievement, and positive intercultural attitudes), can be formulated as 8 recommendations:

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level. This is for all minority children their own mother tongue. Majority children can be taught through the medium of a minority language.

2. In most experiments, **the children are initially grouped together with children with the same L1**. Mixed groups are in most cases not conducive to high

levels of school achievement initially, and certainly not in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects. (Exception: two-way programmes, but even here the mere presence of majority language children in the same classroom may be too overwhelming for minority children, despite the minority language initially being the main medium of education).

3. **All children,** not only minority children, **are to become high level bilinguals**. This seems to be especially important in contexts where majority and minority children, in conflict with recommendation 2, are mixed.

4. **All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction and the status of their mother tongues.** Nice phrases about the worth of everybody's mother tongue, the value of interculturalism, etc, do not help, unless they are followed up in how the schools are organized. Equality has to show in the demands made on the children's and the teachers' competencies in the different languages involved, so that everybody has the same demands (both minority and majority children **and teachers** must be or become bi- or multilingual). Equality has to show in the place the languages are accorded on the schedules and in higher education, in testing and evaluation, in marks given for the languages, in the physical environment (signs, forms, letters, the school's languages of administration, the languages of meetings, assemblies, etc), in the status and salaries of the teachers, in their working conditions, career patterns, etc.

It is possible to equalize the children vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction in several different ways:

A. **All children know the language of instruction** (maintenance programmes, European Schools initially);

B. **No children know the language of instruction** or else everybody is in the process of learning it (immersion programmes, European Schools in certain subjects in a later phase);

C. **All children alternate between "knowing" and "not knowing" the language of instruction** (two-way programmes in later phases; alternate-days-programmes.

5. **All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual**. Thus they can be good models for the children, and support them (through comparing and contrasting and being metalinguistically aware) in language learning. Every child in a school has to be able to talk to an adult with the same native language.

This demand is often experienced as extremely threatening by majority group teachers, many of whom are not bilingual. Of course all minority group teachers are not high level bilinguals either. But it is often **less** important that the teacher's competence in a **majority** language is at top level, for instance in relation to pronunciation, because all children have ample opportunities to hear and read native models of a majority language outside the school, whereas many of them do NOT have the same opportunities to hear/read native minority language models. High levels of competence in a **minority** language is thus **more important** for a teacher than high levels of competence in a majority language.

6. **Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children's mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children's mother tongue**. No teaching in foreign languages as subjects should be given through the medium of **other** foreign languages (for instance, Turkish children in Germany should not be taught English through the medium of German, but through Turkish).

7. **All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through years 1-12**. Both languages have to be studied in ways which reflect what they are for the children: mother tongues, or second or foreign languages. Many minority children are forced to study a majority language, their L2, as if it was their L1.

8. **Both languages have to be used as media of education in some phase of the children's education, but the progression seems to be different for minority and majority children**.

For MAJORITY CHILDREN the **mother tongue** must function as the medium of education at least in some cognitively demanding, decontextualized subjects, at least in grades 8-12, possibly even earlier.

MAJORITY CHILDREN can be taught **through the medium of L2** at least in some (or even all or almost all) cognitively **less** demanding context-embedded subjects from the very beginning, and L2 can also be the medium of education, at least partially, in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects, at least in grades 8-12.

For MINORITY CHILDREN the **mother tongue** must function as the medium of education in all subjects initially. At least some subjects must be taught through L1 all the way, up to grade 12, but these subjects may vary. It seems that the following development functions well:

- transfer from the known to the unknown
- transfer from teaching in a language to teaching through the medium of that language
- transfer from teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively less demanding, context-embedded subjects, to teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects. The progression in The European Schools for minority children seems close to ideal:

The progression IN RELATION TO THE MOTHER TONGUE is as follows:

1. **All subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 2 years.

2. **All important cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 7 years.

3. There is **less** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 8-10, and again **more** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 11-12, especially in the most demanding subjects, in order to ensure that the students have understood them thoroughly.

4. **The mother tongue** is taught **as a subject throughout the schooling**, from 1-12.

The progression IN RELATION TO THE SECOND LANGUAGE is as follows:

1. **The second language** is taught as a **subject throughout the schooling**, from 1-12.

2. **The second language** becomes **a medium of education** already in grade 3, but only in **cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects**. The teaching can be given in mixed groups, but ideally together with other children for whom the language is also an L2.

3. Teaching in **cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects** only starts **through the medium of L2** when the children have been taught that language **as a subject for 7 years** (grades 1-7) and have been taught **through the medium of that language in cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects for 5 years** (grades 3-7). Children should not be taught demanding decontextualized subjects through

L2 with other children for whom the language of instruction is their L1, before grade 8. In European Schools this is mostly not done even in grades 9-12 in compulsory subjects, only in elective courses.

In the following tables I compare some of the programmes in relation to how well they follow the 8 principles. A Utopian programme has been added, one which fulfills all the requirements. Starting experiments with Utopian programmes is the challenge that multilingual Western Europe has. We do have some (but not enough) language shelter (maintenance) and immersion programmes and almost a dozen European Schools, but no alternate days or two-way programmes, whereas the traditionally monolingually oriented United States school system already has two-way programmes in 176 schools (Christian 1994). If research results were to guide or at least influence educational choices...

PRINCIPLES FOR MULTILINGUALISM THROUGH EDUCATION

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level.

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+/-	MI+ MA-	+	+

2. **Group the children initially together with children with the same L1.** No mixed groups initially, and especially not in cognitively demanding decontextualised subjects.

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	-	+	-	+

3. **ALL children are to become high level bilinguals**, not only minority children. (Monolingualism is a curable illness. Bilingualism is to be a goal and a positive model for all).

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+	+	+	+

4. **All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction and the status of their mother tongues:**
A All children know the language of instruction
B No children know the language of instruction
C All children alternate between "knowing" and "not knowing" the language of instruction

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+ A	+ B	+ C	+ A, C	-	+

5. **All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual.**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+ (ma ?)	+	+	+	+	+

6. **Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children's mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children's mother tongue.**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
varies	+?	?	varies	?	+

7. **All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through years 1-12.**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+?	-	+?	+	-	+

8. **Both languages have to be used as media of education in some phase of the children's education, but the progression is different for minority and majority children.**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEA N SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+?	+	+?	+

Consolidated bibliography:

Ammon, Ulrich
1991 **Die internationale Stellung der deutschen Sprache**, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Baldauf, Richard Jr & Luke, Allan (eds.)
1990 **Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Christian, Donna
1994 "Students learning through two languages", Paper presented at 28th Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore, MD, March 12, 1994.

Crowley, Tony
1989 **The politics of discourse: the standard language question in British cultural debates**, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Dittmar, Norbert, Haberland, Hartmut, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Teleman, Ulf (eds.)
1978 **Papers from the First Scandinavian-German Symposium on the Language of Immigrant Workers and Their Children**, Roskilde, March 19-23.1978, 1978, Roskilde: Roskilde University Centre, ROLIG-papir 12.

Duff, Patricia A.
1991 **Innovations in Foreign Language Education: an Evaluation of Three Hungarian-English Dual-Language Schools, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 12:6, 1991, 459-476.

English only? in Europe/in Europa/en Europe
1994 **Sociolinguistica** 9, The International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics.

FIPLV
1993 **Language policies for the world of the twenty-first century: Report for UNESCO**, World Federation of Modern Language Associations.

Fox, M.J.
1975 **Language and Development: a Retrospective Survey of Ford Foundation Language Projects, 1952-1974**. 2 vols. New York: The Ford Foundation.

Haut Conseil de la Francophonie
1993 **Etat de la francophonie dans le monde**, Paris: La documentation française.

Hellinger, Marlis & Ammon, Ulrich (eds)
in press **Contrastive Sociolinguistics**, Part III, Language planning and language politics, Mouton de Gruyter.

Illich, Ivan
1981 **Shadow work**, Boston: Marion Boyars.

Labrie, Normand
1993 **La construction linguistique de la Communauté européenne**, Paris: Honoré Champion.

Lambert, Richard D. (ed.)
1994 **Language planning around the world: contexts and systemic change**, Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center.

Lwaitama, A.F. & Rugemalira, J.M.
1989 The English Language Support Project, in Rubagumya (ed.), 36-41.
McCrum, Robert, Cran, William & McNeill, Robert
1986 **The story of English**, London: Faber & Faber, and BBC.
Mekacha, Rugatiri
1993 **The Sociolinguistic Impact of Kiswahili on Ethnic Community Languages in Tanzania: a Case Study of Ekinata**, Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies.
Ministry of Education and Culture, Namibia
1993 **Toward Education for All. A Development Brief for Education, Culture, and Training**, Windhoek: Gramsberg Macmillan.
Nikolov, M.
1994 **Child Second Language Acquisition**. Unpublished Ph.D.dissertation, Pécs, Janus Pannonius University.
Phillipson, Robert
1992 **Linguistic imperialism**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Phillipson, Robert
1994 English language spread policy, **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, 107, 7-24.
Phillipson, Robert, Rannut, Mart & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove
1994 Introduction, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (eds.), 1-22.
Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove
1994a Language rights in postcolonial Africa, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (eds.), 335-345.
Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas
1994b English, panacea or pandemic, **English only? in Europe/in Europa/en Europe, Sociolinguistica** 9, International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics, 73-87.
Radnai, Zsófia
1993 The language situation in Hungary 1990-1991, in **Language education for intercultural communication**, ed. D.Ager, G.Muskens & S.Wright, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 109-113.
Radnai, Zsófia
1994 The educational effects of language policy, **Current Issues in Language & Society** 1:1, 1994, 65-92.
Radnai, Zsófia
forthcoming Research in Primary School Language Education: the Situation in Hungary, in: P. Edelenbos (ed.), **Research in Primary School Language Teaching**, London: CILT.
Radnai, Zsófia & Koster, C.
forthcoming The Pécs Language Survey: language use and needs in Pécs and the region, in **Proceedings of the Budapest Conference on LSP**, London: CILT.
Rannut, Mart
1991 Beyond language policy - the Soviet Union versus Estonia, ROLIG-papir 48, RUC.
Rannut, Mart & Rannut, Ülle
in press Bilingualism - a step towards monolingualism or multilingualism? in

in press Bilingualism - a step towards monolingualism or multilingualism? in Skutnabb-Kangas (ed.), in press.

Reh, Mechthild & Bernd Heine

1982 **Sprachpolitik in Afrika**. Hamburg: Buske.

Rubagumya, Casimir M. (ed.)

1989 **Language in Education in Africa: A Tanzanian Perspective**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sajavaara, Kari, Takala, Sauli, Lambert, Richard D. & Morfit, Christine (eds.)

1993 **National foreign language planning: practices and problems**, Jyväskylä: Institute for Education Research.

Schmied, Josef

1985 **Englisch in Tansania. Sozio- und interlinguistische Probleme**. Heidelberg: Groos.

Schmied, Josef

1991 **English in Africa. An Introduction**. London: Longman.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1981 **Tvåspråkighet**, Lund: Liber.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1988 "Multilingualism and the education of minority children", in: Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (eds.), 9-44.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1990 **Language, literacy and minorities**. London: Minority Rights Group.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1993 Forsøg i andre lande - hvad kan Danmark lære? i Skutnabb-Kangas, Holmen & Phillipson (red.), 76-92.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

in press Educational language choice - multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism? in Hellinger & Ammon (eds.).

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert

1994 Linguistic human rights, past and present, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (eds), 71-110.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.)

in press **Multilingualism for All**, European Issues on Multilingualism, Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Jim Cummins (eds.)

1988 **Minority education. From shame to struggle**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Holmen, Anne & Phillipson, Robert (red.)

1993 **Uddannelse af minoriteter**, Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, 18, København: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds.), in collaboration with Mart Rannut

1994 **Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination**, Contributions to the Sociology of language, 67, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Szépe, György

1994 Central and Eastern European Language Policies in Transition (With Special Reference to Hungary), **Current Issues in Language &**

Teemant, A., Varga Zs. & Heltai, P.

1993 **Hungary's Nationwide Needs Analysis of Vocationally-Oriented Foreign Language Learning: Student, Teacher and Business Community Perspective**. Budapest: Hungarian Ministry of Culture and Education, Hungarian Ministry of Labour, USIA and Council of Europe Modern Languages Project Group.

Tomaševski, Katarina

1993 **Development aid and human rights revisited**, London: Frances Pinter.

Troike, Rudolf C.

1977 The future of English, editorial, **The Linguistic Reporter**, 19/8, 2.

Truchot, Claude

1990 **L'anglais dans le monde contemporain**, Paris: Le Robert.

Truchot, Claude (ed.)

1994 **Le plurilinguisme européen. Théories et pratiques en politique linguistique**, Paris: Honoré Champion.

United Nations

1981 **Toward a Language Policy for Namibia. English as the Official Language: Perspectives and Strategies**. Lusaka: United Nations Institute for Namibia.

Appendix 1. Programme of the Round Table and questions for advance reflection.

LANGUAGE POLICY IN EUROPE

A Round Table at Roskilde University, Department of Languages and Culture
Friday, 22 April 1994, 13.00-18.00, Store auditorium

13.00 - 14.15
Brief introduction to the goals and structure of the Round Table
Robert Phillipson and **Tove Skutnabb-Kangas**, conveners
Each contributor will speak briefly on the announced topic and allow plenty of time for dialogue between the speakers and the audience. See proposed issues and questions on the reverse of this programme.

Post-communist conflict and compromise, Russian and Estonian
Mart Rannut, Director-General, Estonian Language Board

Lessons for Eastern Europe from language policy in Africa
Josef Schmied, Universities of Bayreuth and Chemnitz-Zwickau, Germany

14.15 - 15.30
Educational challenges in multilingual Central Europe
Zsofia Radnai, Janos Pannonius University, Pécs, Hungary

Educational challenges in multilingual Western Europe
Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde University, Denmark

B R E A K

16.00 - 17.00
The spread of dominant languages (English, French and German) in multilingual Europe
Claude Truchot, Université de Franche-Comté (Besançon), France
Robert Phillipson, Roskilde University, Denmark

17.00 - 18.00
Language policy for the 21st century - lessons from history
György Szépe, Janos Pannonius University, Pécs, Hungary

Research and policy agendas for the future, **all participants**

In addition to the topics that participants speakers have been invited to speak on, it is suggested that contributors consider the following points and questions. They range from the macro level to the micro level. They address general and educational status planning issues, at several levels.

A starting point for an **official language policy** is to consider the **status** of relevant languages, internationally and domestically, and identify which languages the state wants to specifically promote for particular purposes. On the basis of such policy considerations, decisions are taken on the status to be granted in the educational system to the state's own official language(s), its (national) minority language(s), and foreign languages. Such decisions tie in with whether and to what extent these languages are also promoted in other domains (e.g. mass media, trade, as official languages in international organizations etc). In the light of these factors, what **consequences** follow **for educational language choices**?

Language learning can serve a multiplicity of **general** purposes, e.g.

- "nation-building", "ethnic consolidation";
- supranational "intercultural understanding";
- technological development, "modernisation";
- trade, commerce, economics;
- military functions (intelligence, UN peace-keeping operations etc);
- political use and abuse.

Language learning can also serve a multiplicity of **educational, societal or more individual** purposes, e.g.

- social justice, equity, peace education;
- national intercultural understanding;
- broadening of cultural, literary or intellectual horizons;
- metalinguistic and metacultural awareness;
- youth culture, travel, computer literacy, etc.

1. If you were the Minister of Education in your country, which has an **explicit goal of achieving high levels of biiingualism/multilingualism through the education system**, how would you tackle the planning and implementation of an explicit languages policy?

2. How would you broach the problem of according **greater recognition and status to** languages which typically have low status and visibility , e.g. **"minority" languages**, indigenous or immigrant, with traditionaslly little place, if any, in education systems?

3. It is likely that in some countries there is a relatively strong **mother tongue (L1) identity and self-concept** (e.g. France, Finland, Norway), whereas in others (e.g. Denmark) it is maybe weaker. Is this a significant variable in language policy formation and implementation? Are people in some countries in multilingual Europe **less aware** of the need to **maintain their own languages in all domains**, or simply **less interested**? Is a **diglossic situation** (e.g. L1s for elementary and secondary education, English for tertiary education) bound to lead to **partial language replacement** (or **language shift**)?

4. If **diversification**, i.e. the learning of a **wide range** of languages, is a desirable goal, what are the likely costs and benefits? What is the evidence from countries where a policy of this kind has been attempted (Finland? France?)?

5. There is research evidence from both Holland and Denmark to the effect

that the language that **commerce needs** most is **German rather than English**. Should this fact influence language policy in education? How?

6. "How is one to recognize the superior culture? The English, the French, the Germans - which of them is at the highest stage of development?" (**Anna Karenina**, Tolstoy, 1876, Penguin, p. 411). In Eastern and Central Europe, and in European Union organizations, is there any evidence that **German** is being **more actively promoted** (from Bonn/Berlin, Vienna, elsewhere)? What is the effect of **French** efforts (francophonie)? How far are **British efforts** (British Council, private language schools, university TEFL departments) a significant factor?

7. Might an East or Central European country be better served by **collaboration with "experts" from e.g. Denmark or Finland rather than Britain/France/Germany**, on the improvement of their English/French/German teaching? Why? Why not?

8. What role should **norms** play in L1 and L2 learning, granted that many languages are **polycentric** (e.g. German, various types of American or Australian English etc) and great variety in the sociolects and dialects of learners?

9. What **major changes/developments** might there be in foreign language education in the coming years:

- critical language awareness
- receptive competence in several languages
- peace education, global education
- multilingual schooling ("European Schools", two-way bilingual schools)?

10. A **human rights approach in language education** involves the fostering of attitudes - at the local, national and supranational levels - and the elaboration of a structure within which individuals and groups do not suffer from oppression, specifically linguistic oppression. This presupposes that linguistic minorities have the right to use their own language in the education system, the courts, dealings with the authorities, in the media, etc. In principle, European countries are now committed to (some of) this by the European Charter for Minority or Regional Languages - but only for designated national minorities and not at all for immigrated minorities. How should one go about **ensuring that linguistic human rights are respected in education**?

11. Might education in Denmark benefit, if there was an explicit, official language policy for the country (covering Danish, foreign languages and indigenous and immigrant minority languages), as there is in several countries? How? Why does such a policy not exist?

Appendix 2, Extract from **EUROLING project** description (May 1994) on project goals.

Goals

Language is a major dimension of the contemporary processes of increased European integration and changing economic and political relations between western Europe and eastern/central Europe. The learning of languages is ascribed a major role in most European education systems in order to achieve desired linguistic, political, social and personal goals.

The main goals of the EUROLING project are, through a concerted research programme involving scholars from central, eastern and western Europe, to undertake research which can assist the formation of language policy through the publishing of **studies of language policy** at the national and European levels, for a specialist public and a wide audience.

To achieve these goals, the research aims are

1. to develop more adequate, theoretically informed understanding of
   - language planning,
   - language spread and language spread policy,
   - multilingual educational development,
   - linguistic human rights,
   - concepts such as "lingua franca", "foreign language", "second language" and "international language"

   within a coherent framework for language policy, in order to clarify the conceptualisation and projection of European multilingualism and the means for achieving it, in particular through the education system;

2. - to analyse **the spread of** English, French and German as **dominant "international" languages**, to identify the causes of their spread, both internal factors within individual European states and external factors;
   - to consider the implications for Russian in Eastern Europe;
   - to study linguistic hierarchies, and relationships between competing dominant languages;
   - to investigate language status and language functions in relation to language policy in selected European states, for instance in central government and in private companies (such research building on language policy work carried out for the governments of the Netherlands and Australia), and to interview key policy-makers in depth (whether policy is explicit or more implicit), to conduct assessments of language needs (by means of questionnaires);
   - to relate the European experience to comparable developments worldwide, and
   - to clarify the role of education and research in such processes, making explicit what principles of multilingualism and multiculturalism European leaders advocate, what principles of additive language learning are desirable and feasible;

3. - to contrast the role of internationally dominant "foreign" languages, particularly English, with that of **dominant state languages**, and assess the ways in which languages are "defended", as is attempted in some countries (e.g. French in France, Norwegian in Norway) but not in others (e.g. Danish in Denmark);
- to consider the implications of choice of official and working languages in European organizations, and the spin-off from language use in, say, Brussels for working procedures in domestic contexts in member states, for instance working on draft regulations in French rather than Danish in Denmark;

4. - to assess to what extent the increased recognition of the rights of **minority languages** (at Council of Europe, European Parliament, UN, and CSCE levels) in fact results in the successful implementation of measures which support minority languages, indigenous, national and immigrant, and result in a wider enjoyment of linguistic human rights;

5. - to assess and contribute to the development of educational models leading to high levels of **multilingual competence in the mother tongue, second and foreign languages, for both minority and majority students**;

6. - to build up a stimulating international research environment for **postgraduate programmes in language policy at the Ph.D. and other doctoral levels**, with networking between the participating institutions.

Participants

Principal investigators:

Dr Robert Phillipson, Roskilde University, Denmark
Dr Zsófia Radnai, University of Pécs, Hungary
Mr Mart Rannut, Director-General, Estonian Language Board
Dr Josef Schmied, Universität Chemnitz-Zwickau, Germany
Dr Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde Universitety, Denmark
Dr György Szépe, University of Pécs, Hungary
Dr Claude Truchot, Université de Franche-Comté (Besançon), France

Relevance for Denmark of the project

(parallel or equivalent rationales will be/have been written for other countries)

1. Denmark does not have an **explicit language policy**, whether for the mother tongue, minority languages or the learning of foreign languages. Nor is there any body, academic or administrative, with responsibility for elaborating such a policy, or for clarifying the features that a national language plan could or should

have, or for analysing the experience of other countries. (The mandate of the Danish Language Council, 'Dansk Sprognævn', does not extend to such matters.)

2. Unlike many comparable countries, Denmark does not offer **undergraduate or graduate training in language planning, language policy, the sociology of language**, and related areas. There is sporadic teaching in the areas of bilingualism and minority education, but mostly within the narrow focus of the training of teachers of Danish as a Second Language, or as a minor component of a degree course in applied linguistics or a foreign language. There is a huge volume of scholarship in this area, much of it from North America, Australia and the "Third World", but also some scattered throughout Europe. Denmark is under-qualifying itself in this area - while attempting simultaneously to be supportive of efforts in the Baltic states to tackle language policy and planning issues.

3. Scholars working in Denmark and elsewhere in Europe anticipate that the **position of Danish** may be weakened in the European integration process. Irrespective of whether this proves to be so or not, Danes need to be proficient in several foreign languages. There is some evidence that **proficiency in foreign languages** other than English is limited, and that Danes' proficiency in English at some levels is much less than is desirable. Despite the fact that many Danes know English reasonably well, as compared to people in most other European countries, there is both a lack of breadth in linguistic competence (= too little competence in languages other than Danish and English) and a lack of depth (too few people who know one or two foreign languages at near-native levels). There is a need for more concerted policy formation and implementation in the area of foreign language skills, and for clarification of goals and means in learning in the mother tongue, and the acquisition of second language and foreign language competence.

4. As **racism** becomes increasingly visible, and unsolved issues in the **education of ethnolinguistic minorities** accumulate, the need for elaboration of scientifically based educational language policy options is manifest. It is important to improve the education of both majority and minority children. There is an urgent need to counteract prejudice and "ethnic" conflicts in which language is one significant dimension.

In sum, Denmark would benefit by more scholarship in all these areas. Ideally such work should be conducted in fruitful collaboration between the academic world, the state, commerce and educational institutions at all levels.

Theoretical challenges

Among the many issues that urgently need attention are the following:

- the need for refinement of theories of **language spread policy**, the active promotion of a language by a state externally (current issues of the **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, including an article by Phillipson, make a start);

- the need for analysis of **how dominant languages are marketed**, the characteristic arguments used, who develops and uses the arguments, who

consumes them, and how such legitimation relates to the structural power of the relevant languages nationally and internationally;

- the need for analysis and elaboration of **language planning models** which account for both top-down (state) initiatives, bottom-up (grassroots) measures, and study of the role of elites (as in van Dijk's work on elite discourse and racism), particularly language specialists in policy formulation and execution, and the role of language policy in social policy;

- the need for empirical verification and further refinement of such concepts as **linguicism**, elaborated by Skutnabb-Kangas in relation to minority education, **linguistic imperialism** as a sub-type of it, as in Phillipson's study of English worldwide and the role of applied linguists in its spread, and **transglossic languages**, as used in Truchot's study of the role and functions of English in France, and principles for **reversing language shift**, as in Fishman's recent work;

- the need for refinement of such **sociolinguistic concepts** as "domain" (e.g. use of language X for scientific writing) and "special purposes" (e.g. language Y for air traffic control or engineering), and the relationship between such uses and functions of language and the **organization of learning** in the education system;

- the need for critical analysis of the "**needs analysis**" approach to quantifying the "demand" for language learning, as in pioneer Council of Europe work on making foreign language study more focused and effective;

- refinement of the notion of **linguistic human rights**, and how they are understood in different cultures, their codification and implementation, and the correlative duties of the state;

- further elaboration of **models of successful bilingual and multilingual schooling**, for children from majority and minority backgrounds.

ROLIG-papirer

1974

* 1. Utz Maas, Sprachtheorie
* 2. Per Aage Brandt, Om sprogets samfundsmæssighed
* 3. Lis Glebe-Møller, Ansatser til et opgør med den behavioristiske sprogundervisning

1975

* 4. Peter Harms Larsen, Papirer til «Samtalens grammatik»
* 5. Lis-Glebe-Møller, Hvilken slags fransk skal der undervises i i vore skoler?
Henning Silberbrandt, Fremmedsprogsindlæring og fagstruktur

1976

* 6. Frans Gregersen m.fl., Revideret udgave af introduktionen og kapitelindledningerne til antologien «Klassesprog»
* 7. Ulf Teleman, How to become concrete in linguistics

1977

* 8. Ulf Teleman, (1) On causal conjunctions in Swedish, (2) Språk och socialisiation, Reflexioner över reflexioner, (3) Grammatikens tillstånd och behov
* 9. Hartmut Haberland, Review of Bente Maegaard m.fl., Matematik og lingvistik
* 10. Andrew Tolson, Approaches to language in cultural studies
Ulrich Ammon, Probleme soziolinguistischer Theoriebildung am Beispiel von Dialekt und Einheitssprache

1978

* 11. Ulf Teleman, Språkrigtighet i och utanför skolan
* 12. Norbert Dittmar, Hartmut Haberland, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ulf Teleman (eds.), Papers from the first Scandinavian-German symposium on the language of immigrant workers and their children, Roskilde 19–23 March 1978
* 13. Peter Harms Larsen, Tekst og tale – analyser og problemer
* 14. Niels Haastrup og Ulf Teleman, Svensk, dansk eller skandinavisk? En interview-undersøgelse af svenske læreres sproglige situation på et dansk universitet
15. Karen Risager (red.), Fremmedsprogsundervisning på RUC

1979

* 16. Karen Risager og Niels Haastrup (red.), Om anvendelse af sprogvidenskabelig viden i erhvervsfunktioner uden for skolesystemet. Rapport fra den 4. konference i nydansk grammatik og sprogbeskrivelse
* 17. Hartmut Haberland and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Political determinants of pragmatic and sociolinguistic choices

1980

* 18. Hverdagsskrift i anledning af ROLIGS femårsjubilæum
* 19. Elisabeth Bense, Linguistische Theorie und Sprachunterricht
Hartmut Haberland, Status und Legitimation von Theorien der Sprachvariation
* 20. Jørgen U. Sand og Søren Kolstrup, «Il fait rien? Je crois pas que je le dirais.»
* 21. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, (1) Guest worker or immigrant — different ways of reproducing an underclass, (2) Violence as method and outcome in the non-education of minority children

1981

22. Karen Sonne Jakobsen, (1) Gruppeorganiseret og selvstyret fremmedsprogstilegnelse. Et undervisningseksperiment på RUC. (2) Skolesprogene. Om fremmedsprogenes status og funktion i gymnasiet
* 23. Ulf Teleman, Talet och skriften
* 24. Arne Thing Mortensen, Jørgen U. Sand og Ulf Teleman, Om at læse fremmedsprogede tekster på 1. del af universitetsstudierne. 15 beskrevne og kommenterede forsøg.
* 25. Niels Haastrup, Ferie i udlandet & Færdighed i fremmedsprog. Rapportering om bearbejdelse af to statistiske undersøgelser
* 26. Karen Risager og Ulf Teleman (red.), Kønsspecifik sprogbrug — hvad er det?

1983

* 27. Niels Haastrup, Tre debatoplæg om sprogpolitik og sprogundervisning i Danmark
* 28. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Cultilingualism — Papers in cultural and communicative (in)competence
29. Knud Anker Jensen, Kontrastiv hverdag. Et alternativt "Landeskunde"-seminar
Niels Haastrup, Fremmedsprog i det sprogsociologiske billede i Danmark

1984

30. Jochen Rehbein, Reparative Handlungsmuster und ihre Verwendung im Fremdsprachenunterricht
31. Hartmut Haberland og Jacob L. Mey, Godt Peer Gynt er halve verket
Hartmut Haberland, A field manual for readers of "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages" by Bronisław Malinowski
* 32. Annette Bennicke, «Dieu a créé la femelle, l'homme a fait la femme.» En rekognoscering i dansk og udenlandsk kønssprogsforskning
* 33. Lars Heltoft og Uwe Geist, Relevans og intention. To analyser af en massemedietekst om økonomisk politik
34. Niels Haastrup, Uddrag af Christian Jensen Fauerbyes papirer samt bilag. Handout fra Själö-symposiet, september 1984

1985

* 35. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Educational strategies in multicultural contexts
36. Senta Trömel-Plötz, Women's conversational culture: Rupturing patriarchal discourse
37. Rainer Paris, Zur symbolischen Konstruktion politischer Feindbilder
38. Karen Sonne Jakobsen (red.), Projektarbejde i fremmedsprogene. Rapport fra seminar på Roskilde Universitetscenter, 30.11.–1.12.1985

1986

39. Lars Heltoft, Verb-second-analysen – et svar fra Diderichsen-traditionen
40. Lars Heltoft, The pragmatic syntax of Danish *der*-constructions

1987

41. Karen Risager, Cultural studies and foreign language teaching in Denmark.

1988

42. Robert Phillipson and Karen Sonne Jakobsen, eds., Student foreign language projects at RUC
* 43. Elisabeth Bense, Tyskland – et grået land med et grimt sprog, oder: Die Haltung dänischer Gymnasiasten zu Deutsch, Deutschland und den Deutschen

1989

44. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Wanted! Linguistic human rights
45. Karen Risager, Kulturformidlingen i fremmedsprogsundervisningen: 4 artikler.

1990

46. Carol Henriksen, Two papers on `fag(sprog)lig kommunikation'

1991

47. Jytte Becker, Samtaler i hvid kittel. En analyse af indlæggelsessamtaler og deres institutionelle betingelser
* 48. Hans-Georg Grüning, Minderheiten und Minderheitenliteratur — Beispiel: Südtirol
Mart Rannut, Beyond language policy: The Soviet Union versus Estonia

1992

49. Thorstein Fretheim, Grammatically underdetermined Theme-Rheme articulation

1993

50. Bent Preisler, Attitudes, norms and standardization in English: Some aspects of the language in its social context
Claudia Caffi, Metapragmatics and Chauncey Gardener: Toward an ecology of communication
51. Jens Høyrup, Sumerian: the descendant of a proto-historical creole? An alternative approach to the »Sumerian problem«

1994

52. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds. Papers from the Round Table on Language Policy in Europe, Roskilde, April 22, 1994

* = udsolgt/out of print